



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/684,429	10/15/2003	Kanghoon Lee	243747US2DIV	3899
22850	7590	02/18/2009		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER GARCIA, GABRIEL I	
			ART UNIT 2625	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 02/18/2009	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/684,429	Applicant(s) LEE, KANGHOON	
	Examiner GABRIEL I. GARCIA	Art Unit 2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 November 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 21,23-33,35,37-48,50 and 51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21,23-33,35,37-48,50 and 51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 21,28,35,42 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cowan et al. (5,828,840).

With regard to claim 21, Cowan et al Patel et al teaches a printer(e.g. 114), comprising: a communication interface (110) configured to receive a request from a computer remote from the printer (reads on fig. 1, which depict how the host can send and receive data between the host and the printer); a memory, within the printer (inherently reads col. 1, lines 54-60, every printer has a memory that can stores the JAVA application), configured to store a Java application for printing (e.g. col. 2, lines 35-41); a processor (inherently reads on the CPU of printer) configured to execute the Java application in response to the request, wherein a result of the executed Java application is output to an image forming device at the printer; and the image forming device configured to output an image onto a recording medium in response to the result of the executed Java application (e.g. see figs. 1-2, col. 7, lines 25-42 , and col. 6, lines 38-52).

With regard to claim 28, Kashiwazaki et al teaches the processor is configured to process commands in multiple languages (e.g. reads on col. 2, lines 1-34).

With regard to claims 35,42 and 51, the limitations of claims 35,42 and 51 are covered by the limitations of claims 21 and 28 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 23-24,26-27,29-30,35-34 and 45-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cowan et al. (5,828,840) as applied to claims 21 and/or 35 above, and further view of Patel et al. (5,566,278).

With regard to claims 23-24, Cowan et al. does not teach the processor is configured to control the printer using a complex graphics operator. However, Patel et al teaches that it is well known in the art at the time of the invention to have a printer using object oriented language and the processor of the printer is configured to control the printer using a complex graphics operator (e.g. col. 6, lines 56-67). Therefore, it would have

Art Unit: 2625

been obvious to one of ordinary skill the art to provide the JAVA printer as taught by Cowan et al. with the complex graphics operator to control the printer as taught by Patel et al, in order to allow the user(s) to use complex operations to improve the layout the document(s) being printed.

With regard to claim 25, Cowan et al. does not teach the processor is configured to control the printer using a graphical operator which is a subclass of an exiting graphics primitive Patel et al. However, Patel et al teaches that it is well known in the art at the time of the invention to have the processor is configured to control the printer using a graphical operator which is a subclass of an exiting graphics primitive (e.g. col. 6, lines 56-67 and col. 9, lines 15-32). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill the art to provide the JAVA printer as taught by Cowan et al. with the graphics operators to control the printer as taught by Patel et al., in order to allow the user(s) to use graphics operations to improve the layout the document(s) being printed.

With regard to claims 37-39, the limitations of claims 37-39 are covered by the limitations of claims 23-25 above.

3. Claims 26-27,29-30,35-34 and 45-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cowan et al. (5,828,840)

With regard to claims 26-27,29-30,36-34 and 45-50, Cowan et al. Patel et al. teaches the use of a JAVA language within a printer (see details above), the features of claims 26-27 and 29-30 represent the feature of the JAVA language (see page 2 of Applicant's disclosure). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to provide the

Art Unit: 2625

system taught by Cowan et al. with the feature(s) of the JAVA application, since these feature are inherently part of the JAVA application that will be incorporated to any system when the JAVA language is used within a printer.

With regard to claims 40-41 and 43-44, the limitations of claims 40-41 and 43-44 are covered by the limitations of claims 26-27 and 29-30 above.

Conclusion

4. Applicant's arguments Applicant's arguments with respect to the pending claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Yan et al. (6,003,065) teaches a method and system for distributed processing of applications on host and peripheral devices.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gabriel I. Garcia whose telephone number is (571) 272-7434. The Examiner can normally be reached Monday-Thursday from 7:30 AM-6:00 PM. The fax phone number for this group is (571) 273-8300.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward L. Coles can be reached on (571) 272-7402. The fax phone number

Art Unit: 2625

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

/Gabriel I Garcia/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2625

GABRIEL I. GARCIA
PRIMARY EXAMINER
February 11, 2009